UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,669	08/07/2003	Lewis K. Cirne	P1954C-944	8894

21839   7590   03/23/2011
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/23/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/635,669
Filing Date: August 07, 2003
Appellant(s): CIRNE ET AL.

_____

Steven Ashburn

<u>For Appellant</u>

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 01/18/2011 appealing from the Office action

mailed 6/16/2010.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 60-65.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner. The rejection on 1-11, 29-31, 36-38, 40-41, 45-48, 55-56, 58 and 60-61 under 35 USC § 101 is being withdrawn because of the amendment made in response to the previous Non-Final Rejection filed 3/02/2010.

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,844,553   HAO et al.   12-1998

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58

and 60-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hao et al. [U.S.

Pat. No. 5844553].

As to claim 1, Hao discloses a method for routing an event to a human interface

object in a computer system [e.g., Abstract; col. 4, lines 16-32 and 48-56], said method

comprising:

assigning a routing type to an event [e.g., Figs. 3A-3C and 4, wherein the routing

types of Fig. 3B can be categorized as broadcast type [i.e., "shared events" which

includes shared keyboard events and shared mouse events], focus type [e.g., unshared

keyboard events], and geometrical type [e.g., unshared mouse click events]; note that

each of these event types are inherently associated with specific information for

distinguishing among themselves];

receiving an event specifying an assigned routing type [e.g., Fig. 3C; col.7, line 45 –

col. 8, line 26; i.e., each of the above shared and unshared events has an associated

code indicating whether they are shared or unshared routing types];

determining a routing mechanism of the received event based on the specified

routing type [e.g., Fig. 6; col. 6, line 51 – col. 7, line 4; col. 9, lines 23-45]; and

routing the event to a human interface object based on the determined routing

mechanism for the event [e.g., col. 8, lines 4-10; col. 9, lines 23-45].

As to claim 2, Hao discloses a method as defined in claim 1 wherein said routing

type is a member of a set including a first routing type that is routed based on geometric

coordinates of an event and a second routing type that is routed based on an input

focus [note that focus type and geometrical type are inherent attribute of keyboard

events and mouse click/moving events, respectively].

As to claim 3, Hao discloses a method as defined in claim 2 wherein the set

further includes a third routing type that is broadcast to a plurality of interface objects

[note that a multicast event is equivalent a broadcast event when the event is mapping

to all active applications in Hao's system].

As to claims 4-5, Hao discloses a method as defined in claim 1 wherein the

routing type is one of an extensible plurality of routing types, wherein routing types can

be added to said plurality [e.g., Figs. 3A and 6; col. 9, lines 23-45; i.e., different types of

routings such as sharing events with any specified number of applications can be

configured by constructing the shared window data array differently].

As to claims 6-7, Hao discloses a method as defined in claim 1 wherein one or

more clients can register interest in an event such that when the event is received, the

event is sent to each client which registered interest [e.g., col. 7, lines 45-52; Fig. 4; i.e.,

a user may choose to share or unshared the events by moving the pointer (mouse) into

or away shared windows].

As to claims 8-9, Hao discloses a method as defined in claim 6 wherein an

indication as to interest is maintained for each event and is updated when a client

registers and unregisters interest in the event [e.g., col. 6, lines 17-35; note that the

window numbers "n" is dynamically changed for events coming out of each private

window. Therefore "n" is an indicator representing the number of applications the event

is being shared].

As to claims 10-11, Hao discloses a method as defined in claim 8 wherein said

indication as to interest is maintained by adding an event to a handler table [e.g., col. 6,

lines 36-50; note that the Inter-Access Resource Table is equivalent to the handler table

here, which contains the structure of the shared window data array].

As to claims 60-61, Hao further teaches that wherein said human interface object

comprises an element of a graphical user interface that is displayed on a display

device, wherein said human interface object

comprises one of a window, panel, editable text, push button, list box and radio

button [e.g., Fig. 3A; col. 7, lines 12-29; col. 8, lines 4-10].

As to claims 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and

62-65, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-11 and 60-61,

they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-11 and 60-61 above.

(10) Response to Argument

In the arguments Applicant argues that (1) Hao does not teach "assigning a routing type to an event" or "specifying an assigned routing type," as recited in claim 1; (2) There is no rationale or documentary evidence to support the examiner's assertion that the event-type-distinguishable codes are inherently assigned at the sources of the events;" and (3) Hao does not disclose "determining a routing mechanism ... based on the specified routing type."

In response, Applicant is reminded that there are two pieces of information that in combination constitutes Hao's "routing types". When a local user clicks on the "share" or "unshare" buttons, it determines if a selected local window is to be shared or not shared [col. 7, lines 45-52]. From then on, user input events such as mouse, keyboard or cursor movement drive the IEP (Inter-Access Event Process) logic in determining which event goes to which window(s) [e.g., col. 8, lines 45 -50]. Thus in accordance with the example of Fig. 3C, there would be at least six event types tracked by IEP: shared button press/release event, shared keyboard event, shared motion event, unshared button press/release event, unshared keyboard event, and unshared motion event. The first three event types correspond to keyboard and mouse activities occurred within a shared window, while the last three event types correspond to keyboard and mouse activities occurred within an unshared window. Although Fig. 3C only illustrates the first

three events as being associated with a multicast routing mechanism, it is self-explanatory that the last three unshared event types are associated with unicast routing mechanism due to the fact that they are not shared with other application windows. It is noted that the scope of claim 1 is so broad that, even without distinguishing among the button press/release, keyboard, and mouse motion events, the share/unshare information itself designates an event type that corresponds to a respective multicast/unicast routing mechanism.

With respect to Applicant's argument points (1)-(3): it is clear that each of the above six events (or the simplified "share" and "unshared" events) is associated with an event type, whether it be explicitly assigned (e.g., by clicking the share or unshare buttons -- see 208, 210, Fig. 3A) or implicitly associated (e.g., at the various event sources such as the mouse and keyboard activities), otherwise these events would not be correctly directed to their respective event handlers as shown in the three bottom right functional boxes of Hao's Fig. 3C. Applicant argues that "nothing actually requires that types be assigned at sources" but admits that "a predefined descriptor could be hard-coded into an event." It is noted that this inherent hard-coded predefined descriptor or source-originated information is what Hao use to distinguish the aforementioned button press/release, keyboard, and mouse motion events in Fig. 3C. Hao does not rely on any additional assigning procedure to distribute these events to the respective functional boxes at the bottom right of Fig. 3C. Furthermore, Applicant does not teach any additional routing type assigning procedure in the original disclosure either. For example, in dependent claims 2 and 3, Applicant characterizes "geometric coordinates"

and "input focus" as basis for two routing types, while at paragraphs #4 and #5 of the

specification on page 11, the so called "geometric coordinates" and "input focus" routing

types are directly related to the mouse click events and the keyboard events,

respectively. Another example is shown in Applicant's Fig. 10, wherein right after an

event is received (1010), the next step is to "determine a routing type" (1020), rather

than assigning a routing type to the event.

Since claim 1 does not establish any specific routing type assignment procedure

that is different from the originally distinguishable code or descriptor associated with

each of the event source, it is submitted that Applicant's routing type is equivalent to the

inherent information Hao uses to distinguish one type of event from the other types of

event.

For at least the above reasons, it is submitted that the prior art of record reads on

the claims.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Wen-Tai Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454

Conferees:

/Haresh N. Patel/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2447

March 14, 2011

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454